*	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/877,372	SCHOLZ, KONRAD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jessica L. Rossi	1733
All Participants:	Status of Application	·
(1) <u>Jessica L. Rossi</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mr. Hubbard.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 September 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	pplicant's representative)	
Part i.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE G See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sepa did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sur 	n. The examiner will provide a rate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance f the interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (App	licant/Applicant's Representativ	ve Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner informed Applicant's rep that after-final amd. did not distinguish the claimed invention from all the prior art applied in the previous action (most notably GB 1050517 to Werz and US Re. 23572 to Curran). The examiner and Applicant's rep discussed possible ways to amend the claims to overcome the prior art and finally agreed to amend claims 19 and 34 by deleting "wherein the spring steel band is attached to a leading portion of the sliding shoe only" and replace it with --wherein only one edge of the spring steel band is attached to the sliding shoe--. Support for such an amendment is found on p. 10, lines 1-5 of the specification and in Figure 1.